CORRES. CONTROL
INCOMING LTR NO.

5033 RF 93

DUE
DATE

ACTION

DIST.	LTR	ENC
BENEDETTI, R.L.		
BENJAMIN, A.		
BERMAN, H.S.		
CARNIVAL, G.J.		
COPP, R.D.		
CORDOVA, R.C.		
DAVIS, J.G.		
FERRERA, D.W.		
FRANZ, W.A.		
HANNI, B.J.		
HEALY, T.J.		
HEDAHL, T.G.		
HILBIG, J.G.		
HUTCHINS, N.M.	X	
KIRBY, W.A.		
KUESTER, A.W.		
MAHAFFEY, J.W.		
MANN, H.P.		
MARX, G.E.		
McKENNA, F.G.		
MORGAN, R.V.		
PIZZUTO, V.M.		
POTTER, G.L.		
SANDLIN, N.B.		
SATTERWHITE, D.G.		
SCHUBERT, A.L.		
SETLOCK, G.H.		
SULLIVAN, M.T.		
SWANSON, E.R.		
WILKINSON, R.B.		
WILSON, J.M.		
Houk	X	
Busby	X	

CORRES CONTROL	x	x
PATS/T130G		
ADMN RECORD/080		X

Reviewed for Addressee
Corres. Control RFP

11-24-93
DATE BY

Ref Ltr. #

DOE ORDER 5400.1

1A151 113093-16

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION VIII
999 18th STREET - SUITE 500
DENVER, COLORADO 80202-2405

11000 ERM
11010 PIR
11100 RPM
11200 SSC
11300 SPS
11400 FON
11500 RLD
11600
11700 OS

NOV 17 1993

NOV 1993 RECEIVED

000013557

Ref: 8HWM-FF

Mr. Richard Schassburger
Department of Energy
Rocky Flats Office
P.O. Box 928
Golden, Colorado 80402-0928

Dear Mr. Schassburger:

RE: Technical Memorandum No. 10, Operable Unit 1

EPA has reviewed Technical Memorandum No. 10 (TM 10), Remedial Action Objectives for Operable Unit No. 1 (OU 1) and has the following comments. In general, the remedial action objectives stated in the document are appropriate, however, EPA has not yet had the opportunity to review the final version of the baseline risk assessment for OU 1. Regardless of this, insufficient information is provided in TM 10 pertaining to the site-specific values and assumptions which were used in calculating the risk based preliminary remediation goals (PRGs). Since these PRGs differ considerably from those calculated by EPA using standard default exposure parameters, DOE must explain how it chose the contaminants for which PRGs were developed and how it derived these PRGs, in order that they can be evaluated for acceptability.

Specific Comments

1. Page 12, paragraph 3. EPA agrees that the doctrine of Sovereign Immunity **might** work to transform an otherwise applicable requirement into a **potentially** relevant and appropriate requirement. However, this Technical Memorandum does not elaborate on whether or how DOE has applied this concept. Unless the doctrine of Sovereign Immunity is specifically applied, the language relating to Sovereign Immunity must be deleted.

2. Page 12, paragraph 4. With regard to DOE's assertion that Colorado's Classifications and Water Quality Standards for Groundwater-3.12.0 "do not qualify as promulgated standards within the meaning of CERCLA", EPA is deferring judgement on this issue pending further discussion with the State.

3. Page 12, paragraph 5. In several instances, DOE has argued that a specific State or Federal requirement is not an ARAR because the requirement is not more stringent than some

other Federal requirement. This argument is not correct. If the State or Federal requirement is applicable or relevant and appropriate, it is by definition an ARAR and must be considered and treated as an ARAR throughout the CERCLA process. At the Record of Decision stage, the ROD must identify key ARARs and specifically identify any ARARs being waived. Whether or not a given requirement is duplicative or more stringent than some other requirement is relevant in developing PRGs.

4. Page 13, paragraph 4. The RCRA groundwater protection requirements must be considered as ARARs. 40 CFR Section 294.94 provides several mechanisms to define groundwater protection requirements, depending upon whether an MCL exists for a given constituent.

5. Page 14, Table 2-3. The values listed in this table for selenium are incorrect and must be changed to 0.05 milligram per liter (mg/L) for both the MCL and the MCLG.

6. Page 15, paragraph 2. It is stated here that runoff from OU 1 may impact the South Interceptor Ditch and eventually Woman Creek after several retention ponds. This statement incorrectly describes the actual route of surface water runoff from OU 1. The South Interceptor Ditch flows directly to only one retention pond, pond C-2. It is EPA's understanding that from pond C-2, any water released is diverted to Walnut Creek via surface pipeline, and thus never reaches Woman Creek. This paragraph must correctly state the route that surface water follows beginning at the 881 Hillside in OU 1.

7. Pages 16 through 18, Table 2-4. Several values in this table are incorrect or missing. For example, the federal water quality standard for water and fish ingestion for 1,1-dichloroethene is 3.3 E-5 mg/L (EPA 1993, IRIS Chemical Files), but the table reports this as a missing value. Similarly, the federal water quality standard for many of the polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) is 2.8 E-6 mg/L (EPA 1993). The table also presents these as missing values.

   Some of the federal standards cited for aquatic life are also incorrect. The values listed as chronic for carbon tetrachloride, toluene, and fluoranthene are acute standards (EPA 1993). The acute water quality standards for 1,1-dichloroethene and 1,1,1-trichloroethane are 11.6 and 18 mg/L, respectively. All of the values discussed above must be checked for accuracy and correctly referenced in the text or table.

8. Page 20, Table 2-5. This table shows two columns with the

same heading, (On-Site Resident with Direct Groundwater Use), which is apparently a mistake since different values are found in the columns below these headings. This must be corrected.

9. Page 21, Table 2-6. This table indicates that no values were available for surface soil contaminants in IHSS 119.1 at the time of report preparation. Since these values are a subset of the values used to generate sitewide surface soil 95% UCL concentrations that are shown in the table, their unavailability is perplexing. These values must be shown in the revised document. In addition, it must be stated whether the 95% UCL values shown in this table are calculated on the arithmetic mean or some other statistical parameter.

In summary, EPA cannot approve this document without the additional information and necessary corrections cited above. If you have any questions regarding these matters, please contact Gary Kleeman of my staff at 294-1071.

Sincerely,

Martin Hestmark, Manager
Rocky Flats Project

cc: Paul Singh, DOE
Jeff Swanson, CDH
Zeek Houk, EG&G